5/17/82
C2175-1

E CHRONICLE
of Higher Education.

March 17, 1982 • $1.25
Volume XXIV, Number 3

News Summary

Articles on inside pages

Some foundations are discussing ways to save small private colleges endangered by federal cuts in education aid. Story on Page 4.

The New York Times has decided that its name will not be used in the title of future editions of a controversial guide to colleges. Story on Page 3.

North Carolina's supreme court says the University of North Carolina's board of governors can't regulate programs offered by out-of-state institutions. Story on Page 4.

A West Virginia college almost closed its doors a few years ago, but now its budget is balanced and enrollment is growing. Story on Page 5.

State education leaders expect retrenchment to continue on the campuses for the next few years, a survey finds. Story on Page 7.

The president of Northwestern University has refused to give data on individual faculty members' salaries to an accrediting team evaluating its school of journalism. Story on Page 8.

The nation's historic records are endangered by President Reagan's cuts in the budget of the National Archives, scholars have warned Congress. Story on Page 11.

Two Congressional committees have urged rejection of President Reagan's proposed cuts for education programs next year. Story on Page 13.

Chinese scientists are freer from government control than they've been since the Cultural Revolution. Story on Page 15.

Muncie, Ind., is so ordinary that it has become a "sociological laboratory." Story on Page 19.

ALSO IN THIS ISSUE

Books	19-22
Bulletin Board	32-63
Calendar of Events	26-31
Canadian News	17
Deadlines	31
Deaths	25
Fact-File	8
Gazette	25
Grants	26
Ideas	18
International News	15-17
Letters	23-24
Marginalia	2
News in Brief	2-3
Notes on Prisons	3
Opinion	23
Point of View	64
Washington News	11-14

Colleges Advised They Need Not Declare 'Exigency' to Lay Off Tenured Professors

Administrators at ACE seminars are told they may be unnecessarily limiting their options

By ROBERT L. JACOBSON
WASHINGTON

Most colleges and universities can exercise much more discretion than they realize in laying off tenured faculty members, says a lawyer who has been advising dozens of academic administrators in recent months under the aegis of the American Council on Education.

The lawyer, David J. Figuli, former chief legal counsel for the Montana University System and former general counsel for the South Dakota board of regents, also maintains that many institutions may be unnecessarily limiting their legal options by relying primarily on declarations of "financial exigency" as the basis for terminating faculty appointments.

In many cases, he says, college officials may be legally required to do little more than show that—for any one of several reasons beyond their immediate control—they have had to discontinue an instructional program and thus end the employment of certain faculty members.

As long as the officials have not acted arbitrarily or capriciously, or failed to provide due process, Mr. Figuli says, such dismissals are unlikely to be overturned by the courts.

Excerpts from two policy statements on laying off tenured professors—one by the South Dakota Board of Regents and one by the American Association of University Professors—will be found on Page 10.

His advice runs counter to the long-standing position of the American Association of University Professors.

The association's widely endorsed 1940 *Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure* says that, except for "adequate cause" or retirement, tenured faculty members can lose their jobs "only under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies."

Related regulations recommended by the A.A.U.P. have led many colleges to agree that tenured faculty members cannot be let go without cause unless the board of trustees first declares a state of financial exigency.

Mr. Figuli, who specializes in litigation and labor relations at a small law firm in Ohio, bases his contrary view on court rulings in various jurisdictions over the past eight years, and especially on a little-noticed decision last summer by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in a suit against Humacao University College of the University of Puerto Rico.

The case involved two tenured professors of physical education whose jobs were eliminated by the institution's governing council in 1978 after it determined that en-

Continued on Page 16, Column 1

U.S. Seeks to Limit Number of Students Who Qualify for Aid as 'Self-Supporting'

By JANET HOOK
WASHINGTON

With more and more students declaring themselves financially independent of their parents when they apply for federal grants and loans, the Department of Education is drafting new regulations to make it harder to qualify as self-supporting.

The department wants more stringent criteria to meet a concern, shared by many campus officials, that some students are prematurely claiming financial independence to qualify for more aid than they would receive if their parents' income were taken into account.

At a time when federal resources are dwindling, some campus and government officials fear that aid is being diverted from needy students to those who could rely on parental support but have found it convenient or profitable to take the relatively easy steps required to be considered independent.

Other financial-aid officials and student advocates contend that reports of students' establishing "independence of convenience" simply to get more aid are exaggerated.

"It's not so much of a problem that we have to make it impossible for genuinely independent students to get the aid they need," said Edward R. Hanley, legislative director of the United States Student Association.

"The real goal [of the Education Department] here is to save money and to cut students out of financial-aid programs."

Under existing federal rules, students are classified as independent if they:

- Are not claimed as a dependent on their parents' federal income-tax forms.
- Do not receive more than $1,000 in support from their parents.
- Do not live with their parents for more than six weeks a year.

Those criteria must be met both in the year in which the student applies for aid and in the previous year.

Under those rules, some student-aid officials contend, middle- and upper-income

Continued on Page 14, Column 1

Proposed Changes in Secrecy Rules Alarm Scientists

By KIM MCDONALD
WASHINGTON

A proposed executive order that would make it easier for the government to classify results of scientific research and allow such information to remain hidden from the public indefinitely could have "frightening" consequences for university researchers if signed by President Reagan.

That is the conclusion of representatives of scientific associations, public-interest groups, and scholars specializing in national-security issues.

"If this executive order is, in fact, signed and issued in its present version," said William D. Carey, executive officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, "much of the normal discourse of science will be silenced and progress arrested.

The Defense Department has been advised to clarify national-security restrictions on research. Story on Page 11.

"If we then doubled the federal dollars for basic research, I do not think it would make up our losses."

A draft of the proposed order that has been circulated on Capitol Hill specifically states that "scientific, technological, or economic matters relating to the national security," and research in cryptology, the mathematical science of making and breaking secret codes, can be classified by government officials.

While a Pentagon official said federal regulations already allowed the Defense Department to classify such research in the interest of national security, Mr. Carey said that, with the exception of research in nuclear fusion and fission related to weap-

Continued on Page 12, Column 1

Officials See State Funds for Colleges Lagging Over the Next 3 Years

DENVER

Even before the latest round of proposed federal budget cuts for colleges and their students, most state political leaders and higher-education officials were expecting state appropriations for both public and private institutions to trail the rate of inflation over the next three years.

The most likely results, the officials indicated in a national survey, are that tuition will rise, campus maintenance will be deferred, staffs will be cut, capital outlays for construction will decline, and academic programs will be trimmed—in short, a continuation of the widespread retrenchment already under way.

At the same time, survey participants said that the quality of education was the the most important higher-education issue facing state policymakers. Basic skills and remedial education were identified as the next most important issue.

The survey, conducted last fall by the Education Commission of the States, produced usable responses from 214 officials, including 48 governors or members of their staffs, 81 chairmen of state education and appropriation committees or their principal aides, and 52 state higher-education executive officers or members of their staffs. A group of 33 state budget chiefs and other officials also participated.

A 'Broad Consensus'

In a report to be published here this week, Gordon B. Van de Water, a policy analyst for the commission's Education Finance Center, said a striking conclusion from the survey was that a "broad consensus" existed among state leaders on what the top issues were. The same concerns were on "nearly everyone's list," he said.

Besides quality and remedial education, the top-rated issues were renovation or replacement of the physical plant, public-college "tuition levels," and the effect of changes in federal student-aid programs.

Mr. Van de Water said the emphasis on quality suggested that debates about it would become "increasingly prevalent at the state level and . . . increasingly coupled with budgetary decisions."

Over all, about 72 per cent of the respondents predicted that state appropriations for higher education would fail to keep pace with inflation, and 94 per cent of those officials said they expected tuition to rise.

At least two-thirds of those who forecast lagging appropriations also said they expected colleges to suffer cuts in maintenance, personnel, capital outlays, and academic programs.

Asked to predict how their states would react to reductions in federal student aid, 70 per cent of the state officials indicated that the states would expect families to increase their contributions toward college costs.

There were differences among the respondents, however, over the pace of anticipated tuition increases. More than a fourth of the officials from governors' and legislators' offices said tuition would rise faster than the inflation rate over the next five years, but only about one-eighth of the education officials agreed.

In addition, nearly half of all respondents said they thought current tuition levels at public colleges and universities were "about right."

'A Pincer Movement'

Still, Mr. Van de Water observed, "state policy leaders are definitely concerned about the impact of recent funding restrictions in federal student-assistance programs and the likelihood of deeper cuts ahead. These actions create a pincer movement on family finances that threatens to reduce access to college unless states can provide substantially more assistance (a questionable possibility)."

He also noted that the need for renovation of buildings was becoming critical on many campuses. Yet more than half of all survey respondents said they expected such activities to be postponed further because of insufficient funds.

The officials were asked who they thought would determine the areas of higher education to be cut if state appropriations were inadequate.

In most categories, they said the colleges and universities themselves would make the decisions. That was especially true in the case of deferred maintenance, staff reductions, and program cuts.

There were some exceptions, however. Decisions to raise tuition or limit enrollment, for example, were expected to be made primarily by state agencies, the survey showed. In addition, governors and legislators expected to have a greater say in those choices than state education officials thought the political leaders would have.

The survey report will be published in Volume 8, Number 1 of the E.C.S. periodical *Higher Education in the States*. Single copies are available for $5 from the Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver 80295.

—ROBERT L. JACOBSON

How State Leaders View the Future of Higher Education

	Governors	Legislators	Educators
Expected enrollment trends in next three years:			
Increase	14.7%	24.1%	2.6%
Decrease	23.5%	22.2%	12.8%
Expected to vary by type of institution	61.8%	53.7%	84.6%
Community colleges			
Increase	89.5%	84.6%	67.7%
Decrease	0.0%	3.8%	9.7%
State colleges			
Increase	11.8%	29.2%	11.1%
Decrease	64.7%	45.8%	77.8%
State universities			
Increase	14.3%	29.6%	12.9%
Decrease	38.1%	22.2%	9.7%
Independent colleges			
Increase	0.0%	11.5%	6.9%
Decrease	83.3%	65.4%	55.2%
Proprietary institutions			
Increase	29.4%	22.7%	27.3%
Decrease	35.3%	22.7%	18.2%
Enrollment not expected to be an issue	25.5%	22.5%	21.2%
Expected state response to reductions in federal student aid:			
Increases in state grants	14.9%	16.3%	30.8%
Increases in institutional support	8.5%	13.8%	9.6%
Increases in contributions expected from students' families	51.1%	60.8%	76.9%
New state loan programs	8.5%	11.3%	17.3%
Expansion of existing state loan programs	25.5%	37.5%	32.7%
Other action	12.8%	5.0%	9.6%
No action	38.3%	18.8%	23.1%
Impression of public-tuition levels:			
Too high	12.2%	10.5%	13.0%
About right	46.3%	54.0%	58.7%
Too low	41.5%	35.5%	28.3%

	Governors	Legislators	Educators
Impression of state financial aid to students:			
Too high	4.3%	2.5%	4.0%
About right	63.8%	55.6%	44.0%
Too low	31.9%	40.7%	52.0%
Expect higher-education appropriations to lag behind inflation in the next three years	70.8%	72.8%	69.2%
Anticipated result of lag in appropriations:			
Program cutbacks	61.8%	62.7%	77.8%
Enrollment limits	50.0%	30.5%	44.4%
Hiring freeze	44.1%	33.9%	50.0%
Deferred maintenance	64.7%	59.3%	88.9%
Reduction in staff	61.8%	67.8%	80.6%
Increase in tuition	85.3%	93.2%	100.0%
Reduced capital spending	61.8%	67.8%	75.0%
Other	8.8%	8.5%	33.3%
Closings, mergers, or sharing of resources expected to be an issue	72.3%	65.0%	78.0%
Preferred priority:			
Sharing institutional resources	73.3%	72.0%	78.1%
Mergers	10.0%	20.0%	18.8%
Closings	16.7%	8.0%	3.1%
Changes in quality of higher-education system:			
In the past five years:			
Improved	45.7%	43.6%	42.3%
Stayed the same	43.5%	44.9%	34.6%
Declined	10.9%	11.5%	23.1%
In the next five years, quality should be:			
Improved	59.6%	79.8%	84.6%
Maintained	40.4%	20.3%	15.4%
Reduced	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

SOURCE: GORDON B. VAN DE WATER, EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

Pretrial Schedule Is Announced in AIAW's Antitrust Suit Against NCAA

WASHINGTON

A federal district judge has set a pretrial schedule for the antitrust lawsuit filed by the Association for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women against the National Collegiate Athletics Association.

Lawyers for the groups are to have their written testimony and other documents ready in May, with a trial likely in the summer or fall.

But Judge Charles Richey of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ordered the groups to try to work out some sort of merger or other out-of-court settlement before then.

The women's organization is to submit a settlement proposal to the N.C.A.A. by April 3, and the N.C.A.A. is to respond by April 18. The judge ordered that the attempt be made despite the fact that both groups told him they had discussed the idea of merger several times in the past without ever agreeing on anything.

The A.I.A.W. decided to proceed with its antitrust suit after failing to persuade Judge Richey, and later the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, to grant an emergency injunction banning the program of women's championships begun by the N.C.A.A.

Margot Polivy, a lawyer for the women's association, said that because no injunction had been granted, the group had not sent out membership applications for academic 1982-83 and "would probably not be in business in the fall." She said, however, that if the A.I.A.W. won its lawsuit, it might be able to resume operations the following year.

The association has charged that the N.C.A.A. violated antitrust laws by using profits from its nationally televised men's sports programs to subsidize a $3-million program of women's championships, which the A.I.A.W. could not match.

As a result, the women's organization said it could not continue beyond the current academic year because it had lost members, championship sites, and crucial revenue from a contract with NBC.

The N.C.A.A. denied the allegations, saying that antitrust laws were designed to encourage competition and that it was trying to expand competitive opportunities for female athletes. It also argued that its member institutions had approved the women's program, and that "the antitrust laws were not intended to govern noncommercial policy disputes resolved by majority vote of the institutional members of voluntary, nonprofit educational associations."

—CHERYL M. FIELDS

'Academic Trust Fund,' Financed by TV Income, Proposed for College Athletes

NEW YORK

The National Collegiate Athletic Association has been asked to establish an "academic trust fund" for college athletes.

Proposed by a fledgling organization called the Center for Athletes' Rights and Education (CARE), the fund would be used to help athletes complete work on their undergraduate degrees and to expand the N.C.A.A.'s postgraduate-scholarship program. It would be financed by a portion of the revenue earned by N.C.A.A. institutions from television contracts.

The idea was given a chilly reception when it was first presented to N.C.A.A. members at the association's annual convention in January. Most of the members approached about the proposal said it was not needed, because many institutions had already established such funds for their athletes.

One of the few N.C.A.A. officials who sympathized with the efforts of CARE was M. Maceo Nance, Jr., president of South Carolina State College, who introduced the proposal as a "resolution," which does not carry the weight of a new rule. Mr. Nance withdrew the resolution before it came to a vote, however, after other N.C.A.A. members pointed out technical flaws in its language.

Lobbying Effort Begun

Allen Sack, director of CARE, said in a recent interview that he had left the convention "demoralized," but that he intended to begin an intensive lobbying campaign to promote the proposed fund.

Recently, he sent a telegram to Walter Byers, executive director of the N.C.A.A., asking to meet with officials of the association about the trust fund and several other concerns.

The center, which is based in New York, is attempting to develop a network of groups on campuses around the country to advocate ending the "exploitation" of athletes and giving them "fair compensation for the work that they do."

"We think the bureaucracy of the association will oppose everything we try to do," Mr. Sack said in the interview. "But we do believe there is a constituency of N.C.A.A. members out there who recognize the need to do more for their athletes and are willing to move in that direction."

—LORENZO MIDDLETON

FACT–FILE

Endowments of 192 Colleges Ranked by 1981 Value

1980 Rank	Institution	Market Value June 30, 1980	Market Value June 30, 1981
1.	Harvard University	$1,584,580,000	$1,713,350,000
2.	University of Texas	1,261,320,000	1,485,090,000
3.	Yale University	668,800,000	792,600,000
4.	Princeton University	547,750,000	685,763,000
5.	Stanford University †	557,740,000	598,990,000
6.	Columbia University	553,000,000	590,400,000
7.	Massachusetts Institute of Technology	421,258,000	500,237,000
8.	University of Chicago	342,300,000	397,100,000
9.	Rice University	329,035,000	376,865,000
10.	Cornell University	328,696,000	360,441,000
11.	Northwestern University	275,238,000	320,552,000
12.	New York University †	281,473,000	276,351,000
13.	Rockefeller University	228,563,000	270,568,000
14.	Washington University	238,613,000	266,579,000
15.	Emory University †	265,818,000	252,859,000
16.	Johns Hopkins University	198,063,000	242,430,000
17.	Dartmouth College	197,609,000	234,055,000
18.	University of Pennsylvania	224,510,000	232,667,000
19.	University of Notre Dame	172,222,000	218,243,000
20.	California Institute of Technology	187,632,000	202,090,000
21.	University of Virginia	152,311,000	179,697,000
22.	Vanderbilt University	154,493,000	174,715,000
23.	Duke University	135,082,000	153,950,000
24.	McGill University	145,200,000	153,200,000
25.	University of Delaware	131,915,000	143,996,000
26.	Case Western Reserve University	125,207,000	142,286,000
27.	Brown University	123,356,000	139,484,000
28.	Wesleyan University	116,804,000	134,395,000
29.	Wellesley College	131,955,000	133,192,000
30.	Carnegie-Mellon University	119,195,000	132,468,000
31.	Smith College	108,614,000	129,126,000
32.	Swarthmore College	91,016,000	117,066,000
33.	Williams College	96,805,000	117,044,000
34.	Southern Methodist University ‡	101,552,000	116,855,000
35.	University of Michigan	106,128,000	116,482,000
36.	University of Minnesota	105,986,000	113,867,000
37.	University of Pittsburgh	103,937,000	113,216,000
38.	Vassar College	86,445,000	104,834,000
39.	Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute	93,404,000	103,943,000
40.	University of Cincinnati	90,121,000	103,612,000
41.	Oberlin College	93,064,000	103,102,000
42.	Berea College	86,536,000	97,534,000
43.	Amherst College	83,975,000	95,009,000
44.	University of Richmond	77,536,000	88,133,000
45.	Baylor University	not reported	87,500,000
46.	Grinnell College *	43,332,060	85,552,000
47.	The Ohio State University	76,342,000	84,794,000
48.	Loyola University of Chicago	65,156,000	83,615,000
49.	Wake Forest University	65,526,000	77,589,000
50.	Lehigh University	61,924,000	72,980,000
51.	Pomona College	58,913,000	72,530,000
52.	Brandeis University	67,009,000	72,528,000
53.	Georgetown University	66,195,000	71,844,000
54.	Lafayette College	59,952,000	71,558,000
55.	Middlebury College	60,019,000	70,211,000
56.	Rochester Institute of Technology	59,549,000	64,656,000
57.	Carleton College	53,970,000	61,966,000
58.	State U. of New York, Buffalo	57,613,000	61,478,000
59.	Mount Holyoke College	58,200,000	61,449,000
60.	Boston University	46,171,000	60,898,000
61.	Wabash College	not reported	59,589,000
62.	Thomas Jefferson University	52,825,000	58,995,000
63.	Syracuse University	53,400,000	58,816,000
64.	Academy of the New Church	40,901,000	55,797,000
65.	Bryn Mawr College ‡	45,336,000	55,521,000
66.	Bowdoin College	46,507,000	55,303,000
67.	University of Illinois	19,557,000	52,672,000
68.	Earlham College	43,890,000	49,719,000
69.	Hamilton College	41,241,000	49,658,000
70.	University of Miami ‡	38,546,000	47,707,000
71.	Tufts University	not reported	47,249,000
72.	Trinity College (Conn.)	42,992,000	47,181,000
73.	Occidental College	37,743,000	46,555,000
74.	Baylor College of Medicine	30,787,000	45,470,000
75.	Cooper Union	39,750,000	44,393,000
76.	Colorado College	31,534,000	44,181,000
77.	University of North Carolina	not reported	43,605,000
78.	University of Wisconsin System	37,453,000	43,267,000
79.	Rutgers, The State U. of New Jersey	32,407,000	42,601,000
80.	Worcester Polytechnic Institute	38,085,000	41,547,000
81.	Bucknell University	35,611,000	41,254,000
82.	Radcliffe College	not reported	40,347,000
83.	Colgate University ‡	34,904,000	39,653,000
84.	Haverford College	33,052,000	38,179,000
85.	Southwestern University	not reported	37,915,000
86.	Hampton Institute	32,356,000	36,656,000
87.	Agnes Scott College	35,339,000	35,487,000
88.	Drew University	28,265,000	34,062,000
89.	University of Missouri	30,445,000	34,027,000
90.	University of Vermont	25,665,000	32,006,000
91.	Whitman College	28,262,000	31,760,000
92.	Claremont McKenna College	25,155,000	31,516,000
93.	Colby College	26,352,000	29,367,000
94.	University of Santa Clara	21,641,000	28,402,000
95.	Davidson College	25,263,000	27,656,000
96.	Lawrence University (Wisc.)	not reported	27,369,000
97.	Austin College ‡	not reported	27,152,000
98.	Ohio University	25,758,000	27,050,000
99.	University of Denver	$23,946,000	$27,014,000
100.	Teachers College, Columbia U. ‡	25,283,000	26,465,000
101.	Barnard College	not reported	25,880,000
102.	University of Alabama System	not reported	25,795,000
103.	Berry College	21,156,000	25,535,000
104.	Rhode Island School of Design	19,135,000	24,556,000
105.	University of Tennessee-Knoxville	not reported	24,165,000
106.	College of Wooster	20,229,000	24,033,000
107.	Simmons College	19,292,000	22,014,000
108.	Denison University	18,095,000	21,923,000
109.	George Washington University	19,064,000	21,834,000
110.	Spelman College	14,460,000	21,610,000
111.	Sweet Briar College	19,912,000	20,946,000
112.	University of Maryland	17,574,000	20,714,000
113.	University of Wisconsin Foundation	15,737,000	20,281,000
114.	Marquette University	17,588,000	19,827,000
115.	Cornell College	17,439,000	19,280,000
116.	Hendrix College *	18,474,000	18,926,000
117.	Ohio Wesleyan University	17,418,000	18,849,000
118.	Pennsylvania State University	15,479,000	18,320,000
119.	Wheaton College (Mass.)	16,119,000	17,656,000
120.	Dickinson College	17,426,000	17,625,000
121.	Clark University	14,900,000	17,289,000
122.	Coe College	not reported	16,886,000
123.	University of Utah	not reported	16,883,000
124.	Reed College	13,293,000	16,786,000
125.	Wittenberg University	11,420,000	16,457,000
126.	Alma College	13,310,000	16,455,000
127.	Franklin and Marshall College	12,883,000	16,218,000
128.	Michigan State University	14,231,000	15,798,000
129.	Furman University	13,269,000	15,762,000
130.	University of Tennesse-Chattanooga	not reported	15,614,000
131.	Oregon State Board of Higher Ed.	15,086,000	15,377,000
132.	University of Puget Sound †	13,707,000	15,088,000
133.	Baldwin-Wallace College	12,740,000	14,894,000
134.	Kalamazoo College	12,943,000	14,805,000
135.	Wentworth Institute of Tech.	not reported	14,577,000
136.	University of Arizona	11,607,000	14,367,000
137.	Connecticut College	9,185,000	14,046,000
138.	Allegheny College	12,234,000	13,659,000
139.	University of Tulsa	11,856,000	13,537,000
140.	Indiana University	12,160,000	13,452,000
141.	Norwich University	not reported	12,849,000
142.	Temple University	11,707,000	12,722,000
143.	C. of William and Mary Association	not reported	12,204,000
144.	University of Maine	10,489,000	11,983,000
145.	Drake University ‡	12,086,000	11,875,000
146.	University of Dayton	9,997,000	11,403,000
147.	Washburn College	11,027,000	11,403,000
148.	Mercer University	10,272,000	11,357,000
149.	Whittier College	not reported	10,999,000
150.	Kenyon College	8,792,000	10,856,000
151.	Georgia Institute of Technology	10,758,000	10,810,000
152.	Hobart and William Smith Colleges	8,604,000	10,704,000
153.	University of Iowa Foundation	not reported	9,740,000
154.	Muhlenberg College	8,744,000	9,045,000
155.	University of Arkansas	5,895,000	9,005,000
156.	Saint Norbert College	8,099,000	8,659,000
157.	Saint Mary's College (Ind.)	not reported	8,645,000
158.	Wells College	not reported	8,500,000
159.	North Carolina State University	not reported	8,408,000
160.	Alfred University	6,683,000	8,089,000
161.	Ohio Northern University	7,277,000	7,684,000
162.	Babson College	not reported	7,441,000
163.	Doane College	6,096,000	7,333,000
164.	Rollins College	not reported	7,314,000
165.	Skidmore College	not reported	7,288,000
166.	University of Nebraska	6,669,000	7,148,000
167.	University of Scranton	not reported	6,781,000
168.	Clarkson C. of Technology	6,324,000	6,603,000
169.	Augustana College	not reported	6,527,000
170.	Hope College	5,191,000	6,490,000
171.	Carroll College	5,866,000	6,102,000
172.	Moravian College	not reported	6,027,000
173.	Loras College	not reported	6,013,000
174.	University of Evansville	6,312,000	5,936,000
175.	American University	5,306,000	5,818,000
176.	College of William and Mary	not reported	5,529,000
177.	Washington State University	4,811,000	5,351,000
178.	Medical College of Pennsylvania	4,960,000	5,212,000
179.	University of Akron	3,580,000	3,940,000
180.	University of Oregon Foundation	2,737,000	3,683,000
181.	Philadelphia C.of Textiles and Science	3,522,000	3,599,000
182.	Canisius College	not reported	3,538,000
183.	Chapman College ‡	2,925,000	3,157,000
184.	University of Tampa	2,286,000	2,928,000
185.	Trinity College (D.C.)	1,367,000	2,639,000
186.	Western Michigan University	1,484,000	2,564,000
187.	Arizona State University	2,815,000	2,325,000
188.	Newberry College	2,221,000	2,055,000
189.	Eastern Michigan University	1,637,000	1,938,000
190.	University of Mississippi	1,585,000	1,850,000
191.	University of Connecticut	1,778,000	1,833,000
192.	Monmouth College	1,398,000	1,472,000

† As of August 31
* As of July 31
‡ As of May 31

Note: Table includes only institutions participating in the voluntary comparative-performance study by the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Northwestern Denies Faculty-Salary Data to Accrediting Team

EVANSTON, ILL.

Northwestern University, an early advocate of specialized accreditation for journalism education, has lost an opportunity to have accreditation continued for its own Medill School of Journalism, apparently because of a dispute over a request that it disclose the salaries of individual faculty members.

Sources connected with journalism accreditation suggested, however, that broader issues were involved, including questions about the amount of credit Northwestern gives students for off-campus internships, and the status of its undergraduate program.

The controversy came to a head three weeks ago, in the middle of a scheduled four-day inspection of the school's graduate program by a team from the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications.

Saying the university's policy precluded its compliance with a team request for the salary data, Northwestern President Robert H. Strotz abruptly ended the team's visit and withdrew a request for re-evaluation of the graduate program.

Mr. Strotz said the provost, Raymond W. Mack, had told him the panel considered the data "essential."

In a letter to Reed Sarratt, chairman of the visiting team, the president also noted that the school had already provided the team with "detailed information on median salaries" in journalism and other university divisions.

Mr. Strotz's action was tantamount to surrendering the school's accreditation, he acknowledged last week, saying that he and Mr. Mack planned to "put together an outside group" to evaluate the school.

Request Called Inappropriate

Mr. Strotz accused the council of seeking irrelevant and inappropriate information. He said he had recently become "better informed about accrediting practices" as a board member of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, a national coordinating body, and he charged that some specialized accrediting agencies seemed more interested in "gaining higher salaries and better working conditions" for faculty members than in assessing the quality of a program.

Douglas Ann Newsom, chairman of the council's accrediting committee, said it sought information on individual salaries "to be sure there's no discrimination based on racial origin or sex." She said the council kept such information confidential.

I. W. Cole, dean of Medill, called Mr. Strotz's dismissal of the accrediting team "quite reasonable." In a memorandum to students and faculty members, he expressed "regret" that the team had been prevented from completing its work, but he said the situation would have "no effect on our relationships with the professions our students enter."

Mr. Cole said in an interview that Northwestern was "a solid and stable" institution, and that "it's not important to us" to be accredited by the journalism council.

Implications that the salary issue was the only basis for Mr. Strotz's dismissal of the visiting team were disputed by Mr. Sarratt and Ms. Newsom. Mr. Sarratt said the lack of accreditation of Northwestern's undergraduate journalism program was "the real nub of the difficulty." Ms. Newsom said there had been no "insistence" by visiting-team members that they be given the salary data, "yet they were dismissed" by Mr. Strotz. "There was something else going on there," she said.

Northwestern's graduate program in journalism has been accredited since 1948. —ROBERT L. JACOBSON